<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-15 and 17-29 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 15 and 27 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-7 of the Reply.

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the teleconference of June 16, 2008.

Since the amended limitations merely emphasize subject matter as originally claimed, these limitations should already have been considered during an initial search in connection with the subject application. Pursuant to MPEP §714.13, applicants' representative submits that the amendments to these claims "only requires a cursory review by the Examiner" and thus, entry and consideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   Rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-9, 12-15 and 17-29 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 12-15 and 17-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0165895 A1 to Rajan *et al.* It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Rajan *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in the subject claims.

The claimed subject matter relates to a system and method that facilitate viewing and organizing incoming messages based on their respective junk ratings. In particular, independent claim 1 recites a junk message interface system that facilitates identifying junk messages, comprising: *a message receiving component that collects at least one incoming message; a filtering component that determines a junk score for the incoming message, **the junk score is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message, wherein the junk score is a value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk, and wherein a user can override the junk score via a user-based action that affects the junk score of the message and future messages;** and a display component that renders the junk scores as an actionable property on a user interface to facilitate user management of incoming junk messages.* The cited reference does not expressly

or inherently disclose the aforementioned novel aspects of applicants' claimed subject matter as recited in the subject claims.

Rajan *et al.* discloses a method and system that provides in addition to the conventional "Inbox" directory in which all incoming mail is normally received, a plurality of appropriately labeled directories for containing e-mails suspected of being spam, grading the level of spaminess of the incoming e-mail and then moving or copying incoming e-mail into one or more of the spam directories based upon the e-mail's respective level of spaminess. (*See* pg. 2, paragraph [0014]).

In contrast, applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a junk message interface system, wherein messages are tagged with a junk rating and such rating can be added or saved as a property on the message. The system comprises a message receiving component that accepts incoming messages as they arrive at a user's server or personal computer (PC). The incoming messages can be communicated to a filtering component comprising one or more junk filters. The junk filter can score each message based on its spam confidence level, or rather, the likelihood that the message is junk. The score can be a value between 0 and 1. Once the message has been scored, it can be bucketized into an appropriate junk rating based at least in part on its junk score.

Further, if a user has overridden the system-computed or system-assigned junk rating, then the junk rating can be updated to reflect the user's decision. One example of such an action occurs when a user moves a message from the inbox to the junk folder, thus changing the current junk rating to a new junk rating: "junked". Once the junk rating has been updated, the new junk rating can be saved as a property of the message and later exposed in the user interface. Any action the user takes that modifies the junk rating of a message such as adding an e-mail address to a safe or block list can result in a modification of the junk rating of all received or future messages from that e-mail address. (*See* pg. 9, line 23 – pg. 10, line 7).

Rajan *et al.* merely discloses allowing a user to read the e-mail in the "grey" directory to determine if any of the "grey" mail is legitimate mail. Then algorithms may be employed to allow the recipient to vote on the grey mail. (See pg. 2, paragraph [0018]). Rajan *et al.* does not disclose updating junk ratings based on user actions, such that the junk rating of all received or future messages from that e-mail address is modified. Applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a junk score that is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message. The

junk score can be any value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk. This computed junk score can also be overridden by user-based actions that modify the junk rating of a message.

Accordingly, Rajan *et al.* does not expressly or inherently disclose a system, comprising: *... a filtering component that determines a junk score for the incoming message, **the junk score is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message, wherein the junk score is a value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk, and wherein a user can override the junk score via a user-based action that affects the junk score of the message and future messages; ....***

Further, independent claim 13 recites a user interface that facilitates identifying junk messages comprising: *a junk rating field that can be acted upon by a user, the junk rating being determined at least in part upon by determining a junk score and at least in part upon an analysis of the junk score, **the junk score is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of a message, wherein the junk score is a value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk.***

As stated *supra*, Rajan *et al.* merely discloses allowing a user to read the e-mail in the "grey" directory to determine if any of the "grey" mail is legitimate mail. Then algorithms may be employed to allow the recipient to vote on the grey mail. Rajan *et al.* does not disclose updating junk ratings based on user actions, such that the junk rating of all received or future messages from that e-mail address is modified. Applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a junk score that is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message. The junk score can be any value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk.

Furthermore, independent claim 15 recites a method that facilitates identification of junk messages in a user's inbox, comprising: *receiving a plurality of incoming messages; assigning a junk rating to the messages; exposing at least the junk rating on a user interface; **calculating a junk score for substantially all incoming messages, the junk score is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message, wherein the junk score is a value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk; and overriding the junk score via a user-based action that affects the junk score of the message and future messages.***

10

As stated *supra*, Rajan *et al.* merely discloses providing in addition to the conventional "Inbox" directory in which all incoming mail is normally received, a plurality of appropriately labeled directories for containing e-mails suspected of being spam. A user is allowed to read the e-mail in the "grey" directory to determine if any of the "grey" mail is legitimate mail. Then algorithms may be employed to allow the recipient to vote on the grey mail. Rajan *et al.* does not disclose updating junk ratings based on user actions, such that the junk rating of all received or future messages from that e-mail address is modified. Applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a junk filter that scores each message based on its spam confidence level, or rather, the likelihood that the message is junk. The score can be a value between 0 and 1.

Furthermore, independent claim 27 recites a system that facilitates identification of junk messages in a user's inbox, comprising: *means for receiving a plurality of incoming messages;* **means for calculating a junk score for substantially all incoming messages, the junk score is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message, wherein the junk score is a value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk;** *means for assigning a junk rating to the messages commensurate with at least their respective junk scores; and means for exposing at least one of the junk rating and the junk score on a user interface; and* **means for overriding the junk score via a user-based action that affects the junk score of the message and future messages**.

As stated *supra*, Rajan *et al.* merely discloses allowing a user to read the e-mail in the "grey" directory to determine if any of the "grey" mail is legitimate mail. Rajan *et al.* does not disclose updating junk ratings based on user actions, such that the junk rating of all received or future messages from that e-mail address is modified. Applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a junk filter that scores each message based on its spam confidence level, or rather, the likelihood that the message is junk.

Furthermore, independent claim 28 recites a data packet adapted to be transmitted between two or more computer processes facilitating easier viewing and management of incoming messages, the data packet comprising: *information associated with receiving a plurality of incoming messages;* **assigning a junk rating to the messages commensurate with at least their respective junk scores, wherein the junk scores are computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message, and wherein the junk scores are values or fractional values between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message**

11

is spam or junk; and exposing at least one of the junk rating and the junk score on a user interface.

As stated *supra*, Rajan *et al.* merely discloses providing in addition to the conventional "Inbox" directory in which all incoming mail is normally received, a plurality of appropriately labeled directories for containing e-mails suspected of being spam. Applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a junk filter that scores each message based on its spam confidence level, or rather, the likelihood that the message is junk. The junk score can be any value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk.

In view of at least the above, it is readily apparent that the cited reference fails to expressly or inherently disclose applicants' claimed subject matter as recited in independent claims 1, 13, 15, 27 and 28 (and claims 2-5, 7-9, 12, 14, 17-26 and 29 which respectively depend there from). Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be deemed allowable.

II.   Rejection of Claim 6 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajan *et al.* It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Rajan *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in the subject claims. Furthermore, the Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use any of the disclosed variants, such as color-coding, changing fonts, font sizes, backgrounds, adding or altering images, and/or adding or altering sounds associated with the respective messages, to draw the attention of the user to the affected messages. Applicants respectfully traverse the aforementioned well known statements and request that the Examiner cite a reference in support of his position if the rejection is maintained.

III.   Rejection of Claims 10 and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 10 and 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajan *et al.* as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0159136 A1 to Rouse *et al.* It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Rajan *et al.* and Rouse *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or

suggest each and every element as set forth in the subject claims. In particular, Rouse *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Rajan *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1 (which claims 10-11 depend from). Thus, the subject invention as recited in claims 10-11 is not obvious over the combination of Rajan *et al.* and Rouse *et al.*

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP645US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

 /Marisa J. Zink/
Marisa J. Zink
Reg. No. 48,064

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731